

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,726	KUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Lopez	1731	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Pending

(1) Carlos Lopez.

(3) ____.

(2) Paul Farrell.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 2 August 2004

Time: 3pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1 and 7

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was noted to applicant that the body of the instant claims read on any tower and was not specifically drawn to an optical draw tower. Applicant thus agreed to amend claim 1 to include the limitation that the claimed optical draw tower comprised at least one of a preform feed unit, a furnace, a spinning nozzle, a diameter gauge, and a coating unit. The same changes to claim 7 were made and to further distinguish the preamble from the body of the claim.